



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,625	09/22/2000	Christopher Cressy	3000-Z	8136

7590 10/24/2003

John A. Artz
Artz & Artz, PC
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034

EXAMINER

CZEKAJ, DAVID J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/667,625

Applicant(s)

CRESSY ET AL.

Examiner

Dave Czekaj

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9-22-00 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 8, line 3, the examiner understood "device interface subsystem 16" to be "digital interface subsystem 16".

On page 13, line 17, the examiner understood "modes. the" to be "modes. The".

On page 14, line 9, the examiner understood the two instances of "clocking" to be "clicking".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 23, lines 14-15, " said infrared perimeter detection devices" lacks antecedent basis.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacCormack et al. (6144797), (hereinafter referred to as "MacCormack") in view of Jain et al. (5729471), (hereinafter referred to as "Jain").

Regarding claims 1 and 7, MacCormack discloses a closed circuit video surveillance system that analyzes video information. This system comprises a "plurality of video systems to include security cameras and video switchers and/or multiplexers" (MacCormack: figure 1, items 520-1, figure 6, item 636, column 18, lines 34-45, wherein the switches allow the user to change various aspects of the video sequence), "a plurality of security devices selected from intrusion detection, and producing alarm signals therefrom" (MacCormack: figures 154 and 155, wherein the motion detection and perimeter detection are the intrusion detection, column 18, lines 57-63, wherein the alarm is the alarm condition), "a plurality of digital interfaces connected to receive alarm signals and correlating the alarm signals with the video systems and display monitors for sequentially displaying video images" (MacCormack: figure 1B, wherein the video analysis and storage are the digital interfaces, column 15, lines 53-58, wherein the interface disperses or correlates signals to the appropriate cameras, figure 2, wherein the video display is the display monitor), "a computer connected to the digital interfaces" (figures 1A and 1B, wherein the digital interface is the video analysis and storage and the computer is the master node which is connected to the digital interface through the local node), and "one or more video display monitors for automatically displaying video based on alarm signal inputs" (MacCormack: figure 2, wherein the video display is the display monitor, column 91, lines 14-20, wherein the recording is only commenced when an alarm signal is produced). This system further comprises "a plurality of motion detectors, one

coupled to each camera for automatically detecting moving objects” (MacCormack: fig 1B, wherein the video analysis and storage 518 contains the algorithm for the motion detection, figure 154, wherein the motion detection parameters are set up for the corresponding cameras) and “a plurality of perimeter intrusion detection devices, at least one ITD at each location being monitored” (MacCormack: figure 155, wherein the perimeter intrusion device is the perimeter violation tool). However this apparatus lacks the display monitor for graphical display of alarm events in a geographic context as claimed. Jain teaches that the correlation of scene features can be reduced by demanding that the scene and each camera view include constant and readily identifiable markers as sort of a video “grid” (Jain: column 18, lines 5-17, figure 6, wherein the grid picture represents a geographic context). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by MacCormack and add the grid system taught by Jain in order to obtain an apparatus that makes alarm events easy to locate on a display monitor.

Regarding claims 2 and 8, MacCormack discloses “a three-dimensional (3D) visual simulation of the facility to be displayed on the computer display monitor such that the monitor displays a spatially accurate and realistic visual representation of the facility” (MacCormack: figure 153, wherein the facility is the area being viewed which is in three dimensions).

Regarding claim 3, MacCormack discloses that "each said video camera and security device is represented as a 3D sensor icon, wherein the icon represents both the physical device and its coverage area at a position in 3-space corresponding to its approximate geographic location and area of coverage" (MacCormack: figures 150 and 164, wherein the flashlight icon appears to be in three dimensions and the icons are labeled with their respective security device representing the coverage area).

Regarding claim 5, MacCormack discloses "transitions the 3D eye point of the photo-realistic simulation to a lookdown angle optimal for viewing the simulation of the alarm inputs with rapid, smooth, and continuous motion that simulates flying in response to user selection and alarm inputs" (MacCormack: figure 161, wherein the viewing at an optimal angle is the ability to move the camera with the move button and the flight simulation is the effect of the zoom button, figure 151, wherein the user selects the sensor icons to view the corresponding video sequences).

Regarding claim 6, MacCormack discloses "sending hardware or software commands to the video system in response to the user graphically selecting any of the volumetric areas in the photo-realistic visual simulation" (MacCormack: figure 154, wherein the selection box 2570 can be moved from one location to another using hardware or software commands).

Regarding claim 9, MacCormack discloses the "selected area covered by each video camera is highlighted in the photo-realistic 3D visualization on the

display monitor" (MacCormack: figure 153, wherein the highlighted area is the box 2570 which can be moved and/or resized).

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacCormack et al. (6144797), (hereinafter referred to as "MacCormack") in view of Jain et al. (5729471), (hereinafter referred to as "Jain") in further view of Benson (5650800).

Regarding claim 4, MacCormack discloses a closed circuit video surveillance system that analyzes video information. This system comprises a "plurality of video systems to include security cameras and video switchers and/or multiplexers" (MacCormack: figure 1, items 520-1, figure 6, item 636, column 18, lines 34-45, wherein the switches allow the user to change various aspects of the video sequence), "a plurality of security devices selected from intrusion detection, and producing alarm signals therefrom" (MacCormack: figures 154 and 155, wherein the motion detection and perimeter detection are the intrusion detection, column 18, lines 57-63, wherein the alarm is the alarm condition), "a plurality of digital interfaces connected to receive alarm signals and correlating the alarm signals with the video systems and display monitors for sequentially displaying video images" (MacCormack: figure 1B, wherein the video analysis and storage are the digital interfaces, column 15, lines 53-58, wherein the interface disperses or correlates signals to the appropriate cameras, figure 2, wherein the video display is the display monitor), "a computer connected to the digital interfaces" (figures 1A and 1B, wherein the digital interface is the video analysis and storage and the computer is the master node which is

connected to the digital interface through the local node), and "one or more video display monitors for automatically displaying video based on alarm signal inputs" (MacCormack: figure 2, wherein the video display is the display monitor, column 91, lines 14-20, wherein the recording is only commenced when an alarm signal is produced). This system further comprises "'a plurality of motion detectors, one coupled to each camera for automatically detecting moving objects" (MacCormack: fig 1B, wherein the video analysis and storage 518 contains the algorithm for the motion detection, figure 154, wherein the motion detection parameters are set up for the corresponding cameras) and "a plurality of perimeter intrusion detection devices, at least one ITD at each location being monitored" (MacCormack: figure 155, wherein the perimeter intrusion device is the perimeter violation tool). However this apparatus lacks the display monitor for graphical display of alarm events in a geographic context and altering the sensor icons as claimed. Jain teaches that the correlation of scene features can be reduced by demanding that the scene and each camera view include constant and readily identifiable markers as sort of a video "grid" (Jain: column 18, lines 5-17, figure 6, wherein the grid picture represents a geographic context). Benson teaches that brightness levels and icon types can be varied to provide more information to the user (Benson: column 8, lines 38-43, column 9, lines 22-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by MacCormack, add the grid system taught by Jain, and add the changeable icons taught by

Benson in order to obtain an apparatus that makes alarm events easy to locate and view on a display monitor.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US-6014167	01-2000	Suito et al.
Us-6097429	08-2000	Seeley et al.
US-6154133	11-2000	Ross et al.
US-6476858	11-2002	Ramirez Diaz et al.
US-6411209	06-2002	Lyons et al.
US-6359647	03-2002	Sengupta et al.
US-5111291	05-1992	Erickson et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (703) 305-3418. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Application/Control Number: 09/667,625
Art Unit: 2613

Page 9


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600